



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,376	04/19/2001	Steven Edward Atkin	AUS920010278US1	9255

45993 7590 10/05/2004

IBM CORPORATION (RHF)
C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ
P. O. BOX 23324
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/838,376

Applicant(s)

ATKIN, STEVEN EDWARD

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/19/2000
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: original application filed 04/19/2001.
2. Claims 1-24 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims.

Specification

3. Applicants are required to amend pages 1-2 of the specification to include the serial numbers of related applications and their current status. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: "a Unicode character streams" (line 1) should read "a Unicode character stream". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following phrases lack antecedent basis:

- “the character stream” (claim 1, lines 2-3; and claim 17, lines 2-3); and
- “ the tag identifier” (claims 1, 9, and 17, lines 4-5)

Dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-11, 14, 16-19, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Durst et al.**, “Unicode in XML and other Markup Languages”, cited by Applicant’s IDS in view of **Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA)**.

As to independent claim 1, Durst teaches a method for providing metadata within a Unicode character streams the metadata describing information necessary for accurate display rendering of the character stream, the method comprising the steps of:

- inserting one or more tags into a Unicode character stream by spelling the tag identifier
(*Section 4.1 and table 4.1; pages 11-12*).

- inserting a tag separator between multiple tags if more than one tag has been inserted,
so as to create a modified character stream having separator-delimited metadata embedded
within it (*Section 3.3; page 7*).

Durst does teach tags, but Durst does not specially teach “metatag”.

APA teaches metatag (*metadata ‘tagging’; page 14, lines 1-3*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
was made to include the feature from APA in the system of Durst because it would provided the
capability for facilitating the implementation of Unicode in the markup language.

As to dependent claim 2, Durst teaches inserting one or more parameters following at
least one tag with which it is associated; and inserting a parameter separator between multiple
parameters associated with a tag if more than one parameter has been inserted so as to create a
separator-delimited parameter list following a tag (*Section 3.3, page 7*).

As to dependent claim 3, Durst teaches inserting an element tag describes zero width
joiner and zero width non joiner characters, such that multiple characters may be grouped
together for treatment as a single grapheme or text element (*e.g., Zero-width Joiners ‘ZWJ and
ZWJ’; table 3.2*).

As to dependent claim 6, Durst teaches replacing hyper text markup language
bidirectional output tags with the direction tags and directional parameters (*e.g., editing bi-
directional HTML; page 8 and Replacement Markup table*).

As to dependent claim 8, Durst teaches inserting a math tag and a language tag such that portions of the character stream which represent mathematical expressions are delimited from portions of the character stream which represent language (*page 14*).

As to independent claim 9, it is directed a computer readable medium for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 10 and 18, they include the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 11 and 19, they include the same limitations as in claim 3, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 14 and 22, they include the same limitations as in claim 6, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 16 and 24, they include the same limitations as in claim 8, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 17, it is directed a system for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

7. Claims 4-5, 7, 12-13, 15, 20-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Durst et al.**, in view of **Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA)** as applied to claims 1-2, 9-10, and 17-19 above and further in view of **Davis** "Unicode Standard Annex #9 – The Bidirectional Algorithm", published 03/2001.

As to dependent claim 4, the combination of Durst and APA does not specially teach "inserting a right-to-left or a left-to-right directional parameter following a paragraph metatag

Art Unit: 2176

which indicate a direction in which the character stream following the paragraph metatag and parameter is to be rendered for display.”

Durst teaches inserting a right-to-left or a left-to-right directional parameter following a paragraph tag which indicate a direction in which the character stream following the paragraph tag and parameter is to be rendered for display (*e.g. the right-to-left and left-to-right marks; page 4, Direction Formatting Codes*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Davis in the system of Durst as modified by APA because it would provided the capability for facilitating the implementation of Unicode in the markup language.

As to dependent claim 5, the combination of Durst and APA does not specially teach “inserting a right-to-left or a left-to-right directional parameter following a direction metatag which indicate a direction in which the character stream following the direction metatag and parameter is to be rendered for display.”

Davis teaches inserting a right-to-left or a left-to-right directional parameter following a direction tag which indicate a direction in which the character stream following the direction tag and parameter is to be rendered for display (*e.g., the right-to-left and left-to-right marks; page 4, Direction Formatting Codes*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Davis in the system of Durst as modified by APA because it would provided the capability for facilitating the implementation of Unicode in the markup language.

As to dependent claim 7, the combination of Durst and APA does not specially teach “inserting a mirror metatag which indicates the characters following the mirror metatag is to be presented in mirror fashion.”

Davis teaches inserting a mirror metatag which indicates the characters following the mirror tag is to be presented in mirror fashion (*section Mirroring; page 2 – page 3*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Davis in the system of Durst as modified by APA because it would provided the capability for ensuring the correct character code is used to express the intended semantic of the character.

As to dependent claims 12-13 and 20-21, they include the same limitations as in claims 4-5, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 15 and 23, they include the same limitations as in claim 7, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Daniels et al.	U.S Patent No. 5,784,069	issued: Jul. 21, 1998
Edberg et al.	U.S Patent No. 5,793,381	issued: Aug. 11, 1998
Okada	U.S Patent No. 5,889,481	issued: Mar. 30, 1999
Craft	U.S Patent No. 6,070,179	issued: Mar. 30, 2000
Teare al.	U.S Patent No. 6,151,624	issued: Nov. 21, 2000

Gonzales et al. U.S Patent No. 6,204,782 issued: Mar. 30, 2001

Davis U.S Patent No. 6,438,516 issued: Aug. 30, 2002

Davis et al., "Unicode", IEEE, 1990, pages 499-504.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092. After mid-October, 2004, the examiner can be reached at (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
September 29, 2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER